



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Are
W

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/390,824 09/07/99 OBERMAIER

H 10981-1400-1

┌

MM41/1106

HHEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
P.O. BOX 272400
FORT COLLINS CO 80527

┐
EXAMINER

FIGUEROA, F
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED:

11/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/390,824

Applicant(s)

OBERMAIER, HANNSJORG

Examiner

Felix O. Figueroa

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 10 September 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 makes use of alternative language which conflicts with the original language used on the specification making the claim unclear. It is noted, however, that the specification and the drawings, as originally filed, do not provide basis for the plurality of electrical leads, on the card and the chassis. Examples of such conflict language are: a connector referring to the wiring.

Claim Rejections

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 17-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al. (US 5,708,563) in view of Mann (EP 0,349,285 A2).

Cranston discloses a carrier (11) comprising a body having a front end (23) and a rear end (21), a first (61) and second (71) system connectors (first and second plurality

Art Unit: 2833

of pins on claim 21), and first and second guides at the front and rear ends; a card (71) having a lower edge including a card system connector and a bulkhead (73) which is oriented parallel to the card insertion direction; and a chassis (3) including a chassis system connector (not shown), an opening (see Fig. 3), defining a carrier insertion which differs from the card insertion direction and a guide (41).

Cranston discloses substantially the claimed invention except for the second system connector being configured to fit insertably to mate with the chassis system connector. Mann teaches a carrier for connecting a printed circuit board card (30) to a chassis, the carrier having a second system connector configured to fit insertably to mate with a chassis system connector to simplify the connection procedure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the second system connector of Cranston, as taught by Mann, to simplify the connection procedure. Regarding claims 17-19, the method claimed is inherent in the structure of Cranston, as modified.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al. and Mann, and further in view of Welsh (US 4,935,847).

Welsh teaches the use of a handle (30) on the front end of the carrier (12) to facilitate the insertion and extraction of the carrier into the chassis (14). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a handle on the front end of the carrier, as taught by Welsh, to facilitate the insertion and extraction of the carrier into the chassis.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al. and Mann.

Cranston, as modified by Mann discloses substantially the claimed invention except for the adjustable guide. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make one or both of the guides adjustable, since it has been held that the provision of adjustability involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Stevens*, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al. and Mann, and further in view of Clements (US 5,963,681).

Cranston discloses the guide (41) extending from end to end of the chassis. Clements teaches a guide/track (10) of translucent material and a light source (20) to provide information of the system (see col. 4 lines 50-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to a guide/track of translucent material and a light source, as taught by Clements, to provide information of the system.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al. and Mann, and further in view of Beak (US 5,496,185).

Beak teaches the use of a compressive electrically conductive material connecting a card (10) to a chassis (16) to provide ground connection between the card and the chassis. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a compressive electrically conductive

material connecting a card to a chassis as taught by Beak to provide ground connection between the card and the chassis.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al. and Mann, and further in view of Clements and Beak.

See discussion on claims 10 and 11 above.

Claims 13-15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranston, III et al., Mann and Clements. See discussion on claim 1.

Cranston, as modified, discloses substantially the claimed invention except for the plurality of carriers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include multiple carriers, since it has been held that mere duplication of parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2833

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felix O. Figueroa whose telephone number is (703) 308-0097. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



Gary Paumen
Primary Examiner

ffr
November 1, 2001